DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 456 HE 020 580

TITLE	SREB Annual Report, 1986-87.
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE	Jun 87
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Regional Education Board, 592 Tenth Street, Atlanta, GA 30318-5790.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Academic Standards; Annual Reports; College Preparation; Comparative Analysis; Educational Assessment; Educational Change; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Geographic Regions; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Organizations (Groups); *Regional Cooperation; Remedial Programs; Shared Resources and Services; State Action; Statistical Data; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS	*Southern Regional Education Board; United States (South)

ABSTRACT

The 1986-1987 annual report of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) is presented. In addition to statements from the SREB chairman and president, the report contains a program sampler in which progress in the following areas is addressed: improving the quality of teachers, establishing standards and assessments to improve quality in higher education, strengthening student preparation and measuring achievement in high school, remedial education in college, providing states with comparable higher education data, and sharing regional resources in higher education. The statement by SREB Chairman Georgia Governor Joe Frank Harris provides an overview of efforts to improve the quality of education in SREB states. The report from SREB President Winfred L. Godwin provides examples of how SREB states have worked together on major issues during the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. The importance of state action in promoting educational reform and educational quality is addressed. Members of the board from each state are listed along with the date when their term expires. Additional contents include: a listing of members of advisory groups, a list of SREB professional staff, an auditing statement, and a list of SREB publications. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285456

SREB Annual Report 1986-87

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SREB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IE 0205 20

June 1987
592 Tenth Street, N.W. • Atlanta, Georgia 30318-5790

SREB

Southern Regional Education Board

Contents

3 About SREB

3 Sources of Support

4 Chairman's Statement:
Governor Joe Frank Harris of Georgia

7 Report from the President:
Winfred L. Godwin

Program Sampler

12 Improving the Quality of Teachers

14 Establishing Standards and Assessments to Improve Quality in Higher Education

16 Strengthening Student Preparation and Measuring Achievement in High School

19 Remedial Education in College

21 Providing States with Comparable Higher Education Data

23 Sharing Regional Resources in Higher Education

24 Members of the Board

Advisory Groups

26 Legislative Advisory Council

27 Commission for Educational Quality

27 Commission on Health and Human Services

28 Professional Staff

29 Audit

32 SREB Publications

About SREB

The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) was the nation's first interstate compact for education.

Created in 1948 at the request of Southern governors, SREB helps educational and governmental leaders work cooperatively to advance education and, in so doing, to improve the social and economic life of the region. SREB's focus on education stresses the inseparable link between colleges and schools, especially in regard to improving both quality and opportunity.

SREB assists these leaders by identifying and directing attention to key issues; collecting, compiling, and analyzing comparable data; and conducting broad studies and initiating discussions that lead to recommendations for state and institutional long-range planning, actions, and policy proposals.

SREB has no authority over any state or institution. Working directly with state governments, educational institutions, organizations, and agencies, as well as other related agencies, SREB publishes reports on problems and developments in education; conducts efforts to upgrade training in undergraduate, graduate, professional, and technical education; and serves as administrator and fiscal agent in arrangements for multi-state educational services and use of educational programs.

SREB's member states are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

SREB is governed by a board consisting of the governor of each member state and four other individuals from the state, at least one of whom must be a state legislator, and at least one, an educator. All appointments are made by the governor for four-year staggered terms.

Sources of Support

SREB is supported by appropriations from its 15 member states. In addition, funds for various program activities in 1986-87 came from the following foundations and agencies:

William R. Kenan, Jr. Charitable Trust

U. S. Department of Education

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service

Additional Support

Support from the corporate sector is important to SREB's efforts to improve educational quality and, thereby, economic and social conditions in the region. Contributions, in process throughout the year, have been received in recent months from the following:

The Ashland Oil Foundation, Inc.

Batus, Inc.

Callaway Foundation, Inc.

Carolina Power & Light Company

Carolina Tractor & Equipment Company

CSX Corporation

Duke Power Company

Federal Express Corporation

The First National Bank of Atlanta

Philip Morris U.S.A.

Lamar R. Plunkett

Southern National Bank of North Carolina

West Point-Pepperell Foundation, Inc.

Chairman's Statement: Governor Joe Frank Harris of Georgia

> *"The priorities and recommendations discussed herein are, in our judgment, those school-college matters most worthy of attention by political and educational leaders at this time. Their implementation, of course, will depend in large measure on continuing and expanding cooperation among all sectors of education."*
>
> *The Need for Quality*, SREB, 1981

With these words the Southern Regional Education Board introduced a set of 25 recommendations for improving the quality of education. Those guidelines not only captured the attention of political and educational leaders in the SREB states but led the way to the educational reforms that have dominated the agenda in this region for the past six years.

Governmental, educational, and community leaders have banded together to set in motion forceful and often unprecedented measures to improve the quality of education in our schools and colleges.

The major educational improvement bills enacted in SREB states set the pace for similar actions across the nation. In most cases, following debate and discussions, these bills received unwavering support from the public, as well as the executive and legislative branches of state government.

To use Georgia as an example, our Quality Basic Education Act passed both chambers of the General Assembly unanimously in 1985. The measures in that bill represent major changes in the educational system in our state. Teachers must meet standards of competence. Schools and school systems are held accountable for the level of educational progress. Our student assessment program has been expanded to emphasize the bottom line—student achievement. More than ever, we are attempting to determine students' progress in key areas of knowledge and to identify individual learning needs.

The amount of new state funds going to education has risen dramatically in our region. In Georgia, we have added over one billion new dollars for public education in the past five years. That increase of nearly 58 percent has brought Georgia's annual state budget for all public education to $3.1 billion. Dramatic changes have also been made in the funding structure for public schools so that funding is now more directly related to actual needs, such as compensation for teachers and costs of instructional materials and enrichment programs, rather than average daily attendance.

Almost $50 million of these new funds for education have been used for improvements in the higher education formula which were aimed at upgrading instructional equipment and maintaining facilities, reducing faculty workloads, and assisting research institutions. Not only have we fully funded the University System of Georgia funding formula, we have also raised our university faculty salaries to the top of the SREB states. We have begun an Eminent Scholars program at our four university-level institutions to attract faculty members who are considered preeminent in their fields. The Georgia Research Consortium has been created to coordinate high-tech research efforts sponsored by the private sector and conducted at the state's public and private universities.

Equally dramatic moves to improve quality have occurred in other SREB states. Much remains to be accomplished, however, if we are to meet our long range goals for quality education. These goals will take commitment and honest appraisals of where we are succeeding and where we must redouble our efforts. The Southern Regional Educational Board is encouraging the assessment of how well our reforms are working and the identification of what remains to be done.

The SREB Commission for Educational Quality, chaired by former Governor Richard Riley of South Carolina, has set the stage for states' future action with its *Progress Report and Recommendations on Educational Improvements in the SREB States.* Based on surveys of state departments of education and state higher education agencies, the SREB Commission for Educational Quality has assessed the progress that has been made since the 1981 *Need for Quality* recommendations and has suggested areas still requiring decisive actions for improvement.

SREB states have made remarkable progress in acting to improve education in high school, notably through improving the curriculum and increasing graduation requirements. Strides have been made toward strengthening the teaching force, particularly in conscious efforts to raise teachers' salaries and to assure that beginning teachers possess the knowledge and skills that are essential for classroom success.

We can be justifiably proud of many of the actions which have been taken. Yet, what remains ahead may well turn out to be more difficult than our efforts to date. Capturing interest in our initial efforts was one thing; sustaining that interest through the process of slow, steady improvements is something else again. Keeping the momentum and interest high will undoubtedly be equally, if not more, challenging and will call for the same kind of strong leadership and belief in our cause that has brought us to the point we have reached in our region.

As we move into the next phase of educational improvement, many of our states are undergoing a "changing of the guard" in key policy-setting positions. Within the past year, new governors have taken office in half of the SREB states. In half of our states, there are new directors of state higher education agencies and/or heads of state departments of education. Across the region, an unusually high number of college and university presidents have retired or moved to other positions.

These new leaders and those of us who are continuing must "stay the course" for educational improvement. We must keep education high on the agenda for needed action and in the forefront of the public's major considerations. Capturing and holding interest in education is a necessity if educational improvements are to gain essential taxpayer support.

To date, states have done remarkably well in gaining support from the public. To assure continued support, we will have to prove that what we are doing is worth the price. The public will, justifiably, have to know that the educational system is improving; that children are learning more; and that young graduates are leaving our high schools and colleges well educated and able to take their places in society and to assume the responsibilities that go with good citizenship.

We must evaluate carefully those reforms that are in place. Are programs doing what was intended? Are changes needed to make them more effective? If so, what kind of changes will bring about improvement? Caution is the operative word in this process. By their very nature, some of the measures we have undertaken simply will not produce immediate results; only over a reasonable period of time will we be able to make sound judgments about their effectiveness. Therefore, we must not "leap in" and make changes without concrete evidence that some adjustment is required. Above all, we must not abandon programs before we have given them a chance to work. By the same token, we cannot afford to sit back and assume that every program as it was originally conceived and initiated is perfect; in many cases, some alterations should be made.

The best way to make these critical determinations is to measure progress accurately. One obvious measure of improvement is to assess students to see whether they have the skills judged necessary to proceed to the next level of learning. In Georgia, we are testing students at most grade levels, but we have identified several critical points in the students' progress up the educational ladder: Before they enter first grade, before they enter the fourth grade, and before they graduate from high school. All undergraduate students must take the Georgia Regents' Test before they enter the junior level, and a passing score is required before they are awarded an undergraduate degree.

There is, however, a need to know more about key indicators of educational quality. SREB's *Progress Report* notes that there should be a record of students' course-taking patterns and that data should be available on student achievement, not only within each state but across state lines.

Another way to measure progress is to channel information to the schools on how well their graduates are doing in college; Georgia has set up a feedback system for this purpose. It is clear that in setting educational policies, a broad base of significant information is needed.

There are two problems that are of special concern in Georgia, the South, and the nation. One is the frightening high school dropout rate. Nationally, about one-third of the students who enter the ninth grade do not graduate from high school. In many SREB states, the rate is even higher. Each year, nearly 400,000 students in this region drop out of school without the basic minimal skills needed for employment in skilled jobs.

Current educational reform emphasizes school readiness, reading, and early identification of students who need help. These emphases should help to slow the dropout rate, but we must intensify our efforts to keep students in high school through graduation. A first step in this effort is to determine more precisely the size and nature of the dropout problem and then to set specific goals and actions to reduce the rate significantly.

Directly related to the high school dropout problem is that of adult illiteracy. It is appalling that in this nation with the best educational system in the world, approximately one in five adults is functionally illiterate, without the reading and writing competencies to meet the minimal demands of daily living. Each year, every one of our states loses vast sums of money because of illiteracy through unemployment and underemployment, public assistance benefits, and community action program costs. In Georgia, I have appointed a special task force to identify the most effective ways to teach adult illiterates and set forth a plan to aggressively attack this problem.

Because our competition for industries and jobs is now international, the economic growth of our region will be threatened if we do not significantly reduce the rate of adult illiteracy. We can succeed if we marshal the forces of concerned leaders in the business community and in the governmental, educational, and social service arenas.

The ability of leaders in the SREB states to work together in support of educational improvement has been clearly demonstrated in recent years. That same kind of leadership will be required if we are to "stay the course" for long-term educational improvements.

Report from the President: Winfred L. Godwin

> *"States, schools, and colleges must act jointly to strengthen education at all levels."*
>
> *The Need for Quality*, SREB, 1981

> *"The long-term commitment to educational quality requires a commitment of both will and dollars."*
>
> *A Progress Report and Recommendations on Educational Improvements in the SREB States*, SREB, 1987

These two statements embody the mission of the Southern Regional Education Board as envisioned by the Southern governors who created this Board nearly 40 years ago. This mission points the way for this Board and for governmental and educational leaders in SREB states in the years ahead. Improving the quality of education, and thus the social and economic well-being of SREB states and their citizens, is a goal for all of us. Accomplishing that goal will come about only if leaders in the SREB states demonstrate their long-term commitment and insist that the relationship between schools and colleges is at the center of state efforts to improve educational quality.

Early last summer the Southern Regional Education Board moved into new permanent headquarters on the Georgia Tech campus. During the inevitable "sorting out" of papers, thoughts, and memories, I was reminded time and again of long-term commitments made by farsighted governmental and educational leaders facing equally challenging educational issues.

The first example that came to mind was, obviously, the vision of those governors who recognized the value of a strong educational system and created the Southern Regional Education Board as the nation's first interstate compact for the advancement of education. Through the years SREB has passed many milestones that attest to leadership in this region. Many of SREB's current activities stem from actions taken many years ago that have influenced the lives of untold numbers of citizens in SREB states.

A very early milestone focused on interstate sharing of graduate and professional programs to combat shortages of trained professionals and educational opportunities in the region. Thousands of doctors, dentists, and other professionals in SREB states have received their professional education through the Student Contract Program administered by SREB. The SREB Academic Common Market Program, established in the Seventies, is another example of leadership in regional sharing. Nearly 1,000 specialized graduate and undergraduate programs at more than 110 colleges and universities are offered to residents of participating states at in-state tuition rates. Thus, unnecessary duplication is avoided and institutions are able to strengthen their offerings.

In the most recent example of leadership in regional sharing, six SREB states (Arkansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia), along with Connecticut and New York, have taken a step that represents a major breakthrough in the joint development of teacher certification examinations. Developing tests for teacher certification is a very costly process and, through this cooperative effort, costs for individual states will be reduced significantly.

The Fifties saw establishment of a special SREB program to expand training and research in mental health professions. As changes in health care have occurred, the SREB program has broadened to include education, supply, distribution, and cost issues in all facets of the health care system, with a focus on concern for strong academic health centers. The state leaders representing a broad range of health care interests who serve on SREB's Commission on Health and Human Services offer advice and counsel about practical solutions to current problems.

At the beginning of the Sixties, higher education was facing an influx of students that heralded the beginning of a new era emphasizing access to collegiate study for anyone desiring it. SREB's Goals Commission responded by advancing long-term goals for excellence in higher education in the region and ways to achieve them. Today's SREB Commission for Educational Quality is emphasizing the need for maintaining access but is stressing concern for quality—finding ways to improve education in the region's schools and colleges.

In the decade of the Sixties, SREB advocated and provided assistance to states in establishing, restructuring, or strengthening state structures and procedures for the coordination and governance of higher education. Today, SREB and state agencies cooperate in a regional network for the collection and analysis of data on public colleges and universities. SREB has become "the source" for comparable national, regional, and state data on significant factors affecting the progress of education. Every day staff respond to requests for information from educational and governmental leaders making policy decisions and playing active roles in statewide planning for higher education.

It was also during the Sixties that SREB launched its program to expand and improve postsecondary educational opportunities for black students in both predominantly black and predominantly white institutions. Currently, for example, SREB is seeking ways to increase the number of black teachers being prepared and develop methods for improving black students' ability in the test-taking skills required for success on teacher certification exams.

Since the 1970s, the William R. Kenan, Jr. Charitable Trust has committed nearly $12 million to SREB efforts to help historically black colleges strengthen their instructional programs. Learning centers established with Kenan support continue to operate with institutional support to help students gain needed skills to succeed in professional fields and graduate study. A new SREB-Kenan initiative got underway this year to help historically black colleges raise standards by working closely with nearby school systems to increase the number of black students who are prepared for college when they graduate from high school.

In the Seventies, SREB's *Priorities for Postsecondary Education in the South* made recommendations for state and institutional actions that would sustain the vitality of higher education in the face of stable enrollments and increasingly scarce resources. At the same time, the SREB office of state services was established to respond promptly to requests from state officials for information as they faced changing conditions and new educational decisions.

These, of course, are not the only milestones passed by SREB in the first three decades of its history, but they do provide outstanding examples of how the SREB states working together with the guidance of farsighted leaders have identified vital issues and responded with firm actions leading to long-term benefits for the region's citizens.

It has been in the Eighties, however, that the leadership of the SREB states in response to improving the quality of education has received national recognition and acclaim.

In 1981—two years before national reports on the status of American education appeared—a report from the Southern Regional Education Board, *The Need for Quality,* advanced the nation's first proposals for educational reform. That report emphasized—and SREB was unique in doing so—the relationship between higher education and the schools. The recommendations focused on three areas: establishing higher academic standards in schools and colleges, improving the quality of teachers and other school personnel, and strengthening coordination throughout the educational system so these goals could be accomplished.

The compelling need for prompt and decisive actions for educational improvement was recognized and the SREB state initiatives were soon setting the pace for the entire nation. There is no question that the programs for educational improvement enacted in the SREB states have been impressive but, at the same time, it is apparent that realization of our ultimate goals for quality education is a long-term proposition.

To make informed decisions on educational reform policies, legislation, and procedures, state leaders need a clear picture of where things stand and directions for further action. With this in mind, this year SREB is issuing *A Progress Report and Recommendations on Educational Improvements in the SREB States.* The *Progress Report* reviews state initiatives related to the original 25 recommendations set forth in *The Need for Quality* as well as actions on subsequent SREB proposals for educational improvement.

SREB states have essentially met the challenge of establishing initial standards to improve the quality of public school education. In higher education, changes have been less dramatic and not as widespread.

More demanding high school academic requirements are a reality in all of the SREB states. States have enacted new standards for high school graduation that include additional mathematics and science courses. College-bound students in most states can earn a special diploma requiring additional academic courses. The number of high school students taking Advanced Placement courses and examinations qualifying for college credit has jumped dramatically. And, many states now require students to spend larger portions of their school time in classroom instruction.

These changes are the result of innovative reform packages that were enacted because governmental and educational leaders put aside political and philosophical differences to unite in the common cause of improving educational quality. In Georgia, for example, the Quality Basic Education Act, which calls for a broad range of procedures to assure that quality standards are being met, passed unanimously. South Carolina's sweeping reform package includes among other things, state intervention in those school districts that do not meet established standards.

All 15 SREB states currently have in effect or have recommended increased numbers of units in college preparatory courses for admission to four-year colleges and universities. Several states have statewide programs to bring information about higher college admission standards directly to high school students and secondary school administrators and counselors. Florida, Georgia, and Tennessee already have statewide testing for placing students in degree-credit study or remedial programs after they are admitted to college. Placement testing has been recommended or mandated in Texas and Arkansas, and South Carolina, Louisiana, and Virginia are considering similar programs. A majority of the states have or are moving toward a common core of required general education college courses.

In the early 1980s, the immediate challenge for improving the quality of classroom instruction was to implement minimum standards for teachers. All of the SREB states accepted that challenge with actions focusing on testing to enter teacher education programs and for certification, on-the-job assessment and assistance for beginning teachers, and evaluation of all teachers in the classroom.

Programs to attract and retain teachers, such as loan-scholarships and alternative certification for arts and science graduates, are now common. The most controversial and, perhaps, far-reaching change is coming as states follow the lead of Tennessee in developing career ladder programs to reward outstanding performance in the classroom. Leadership was clearly demonstrated by Tennessee's governor who insisted that the prevailing reward system by which teachers were "not paid one penny more for doing a good job" had to be changed. Despite strong opposition and cynics' declarations that pay based on performance wouldn't work, teacher incentive programs have spread like wildfire. Across the nation, 29 states—13 are SREB states—are now implementing large-scale statewide programs, providing state funding for locally developed plans, pilot-testing models, or have state board of education or legislative mandates for development of performance-based incentive programs for teachers and school administrators. The process of selecting and preparing school principals who will be effective is receiving attention. Most SREB states require a written test for certification and have state-developed procedures to evaluate principals. In some cases, the selection now includes an assessment of skills and more college programs include internships. Several states have established leadership academies to help principals develop skills that will make them more effective.

These actions are commendable, but it is important to bear in mind that if ultimate goals for quality education are to be achieved, state educational and governmental leaders will have to make strong commitments to sustain and build support for educational reform over the long term.

The introduction to the SREB *Progress Report* poses several questions that state leaders should ask periodically for years to come.

> Are the reforms, which have been primarily state-level actions, becoming a central part of the real operation of schools and colleges?
>
> Are the reforms working? That is, are they having the intended results?
>
> Are states giving the reforms a chance to work by providing the necessary long-term support and commitment?
>
> Can states resist the urge to demand immediate results or to tinker with programs that don't make a dramatic showing at once?
>
> What effect will school reform have on higher education?
>
> Are the initial stirrings of change at colleges and universities leading to improvements in undergraduate education?

SREB's *Progress Report* does far more than cite those areas in which advances have been made. It also makes specific recommendations for dealing with ongoing and worrisome concerns.

Another new SREB report, *Access to Quality Undergraduate Education in the Two-Year College,* focuses on strengthening the standards and curriculum in the two-year college, which plays a vital role in American higher education. Half of this nation's college freshmen begin their collegiate experience in two-year colleges. In some SREB states, nearly two-thirds of teacher education graduates start their baccalaureate studies at two-year colleges. And, the nearby two-year college with low tuition has provided ready access to higher education for all who seek it. A new challange is clear for the two-year college: The advances made in providing access must be retained, *and* standards must be raised. This new SREB report sets forth specific recommendations to bring about quality improvement in the two-year college.

The proposals in both publications recognize that state actions to date provide a solid foundation for further improvements. Some of the recommendations are directed to areas that were identified early in the reform movement—moving beyond minimum course requirements for high school graduation and developing standards and assessments for placing students in college courses that count toward earning a degree. Other suggestions relate to long-standing challenges not previously identified—setting specific state goals for reducing dropout rates and establishing state policies to encourage notable increases in joint school-college efforts.

While some of the suggested actions may have a familiar ring, all of the recommendations are directed to deep concerns that affect educational quality which, in turn, bears a direct relationship to the economic and social well-being of our states. Many of these issues have been part of SREB's programs throughout the year. More about them will be found in the program sampler of this Annual Report.

State governmental and educational leaders must direct, and redirect when necessary, the public's attention to the significance of improving quality throughout the entire educational system. State leaders will have to demonstrate their long-term commitment to educational quality by providing needed support, both financial support and moral support. They cannot waiver in their concern for bringing about improvement.

Schools and colleges must be able to show that students are learning more if they expect to continue to receive support from state governmental leaders and from the public.

Accomplishing our long-range goals will require the courage to "stand up and be counted" in the ranks of advocates for educational reform. Webster notes that courage "implies firmness of mind and will in the face of extreme difficulty." The period ahead will be extremely difficult. But, just as governmental and educational leaders in the SREB states over the years have pursued and reached many of their long-range goals, so too with a commitment of will and dollars, will today's state leaders reach the long-range educational improvement goals. And, just as in the past, the Southern Regional Education Board will assist today's leaders. SREB will help to identify exemplary programs and report on state initiatives so that leaders in our states who are making policy decisions will have the best available information at hand.Working together and with strong leadership, the SREB states will be successful in continuing to lead the nation with educational policies that reflect our ultimate goal—improved student learning.

Improving the Quality of Teachers

"Success in attracting and retaining quality teachers hinges on no single factor."

The Need for Quality, SREB, 1981

Because improving the quality of classroom instruction depends on a variety of factors, SREB activities related to teaching quality have taken many forms—conferences to discuss mutual problems, share experiences, and set directions for further actions; surveys and reports on their findings; and consultations with state governmental and educational leaders. Activities have focused on teacher preparation, certification, shortages, and reward systems.

During the past year debate has increased sharply over how best to strengthen future teachers' knowledge in the subjects they will teach. Late last spring, two reports were released that proposed five years of college preparation for beginning teachers and abolition of the four-year teacher education program and degree. SREB issued a brief summary of these recommendations—made by the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy—and compared them with the SREB recommendations on improving teacher education.

SREB proposes that until the current four-year undergraduate curriculum is revitalized, such drastic changes are premature. SREB's extensive study of courses teacher education majors take indicates that there is, indeed, the opportunity to improve teacher education in a four-year curriculum. SREB's position is that states should not commit the extra dollars and time for extending teacher education programs until there is evidence that this costly alternative would produce better results in the quality of instruction in the classroom.

Recommendations in the new SREB *Progress Report and Recommendations on Educational Improvements in the SREB States* call for making improvement in teacher education a top priority, examining four-year teacher education programs and acting on needed changes, and pilot-testing extended programs before abolishing the four-year programs.

The *Progress Report* spotlights a serious problem throughout our region—the diminishing supply of qualified minority teachers. Many minority candidates have difficulty passing the teacher certification tests now required in all SREB states. An ongoing SREB project, partially supported by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education (FIPSE), has been working with a group of historically black colleges and universities to strengthen the teacher education curriculum and improve the test-taking and problem-solving skills of their graduates. Staff and consultants have been helping faculty in the design of curriculum and course tests that will develop the needed test-taking abilities which will lead to their students' success.

Two regional meetings were held with faculty and administrators from historically black colleges in the SREB states to discuss areas for improvement in teacher education programs. Discussions focused on techniques that have been developed by institutions participating in the project and successful programs for strengthening students' analytical skills. The idea is to share practical experiences that can be applied or adapted and help lead to improvements in the teacher education programs of historically black colleges across the region.

Shortages of teachers, particularly in mathematics and science, are cropping up across the nation and are a reality in many SREB states. Fewer persons are graduating from college prepared to teach and large numbers of science and mathematics teachers are leaving the classroom to pursue careers in business and industry. And, as students are required to take more math and science courses for high school graduation and colleges emphasize better preparation for entering students, high schools are increasing their course offerings. To combat the shortages, SREB has encouraged member states to undertake new initiatives to attract and keep more qualified teachers through offering loan-scholarships to future math and science teachers, providing alternative certification for arts and sciences graduates, and offering retraining programs enabling teachers certified in another field to switch to a shortage field.

All of the SREB states require subject matter tests for teacher certification, and this year six SREB states (Arkansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia), along with Connecticut and New York, have taken a step that represents a major breakthrough in the joint development of teacher certification examinations. In cooperation with Educational Testing Service and SREB, these states are jointly developing or adapting 10 teacher certification tests built around a core of common objectives. Developing tests for teacher certification is a very costly process and, through this cooperative effort, costs for individual states will be reduced significantly.

Many feel that the most far-reaching change in teaching has been career ladder or other incentive programs to reward outstanding performance in the classroom. This move, which started in Tennessee, has swept across the nation, and the SREB Career Ladder Clearinghouse has become the recognized source for up-to-date information on performance-based programs. Again this year, the SREB Clearinghouse surveyed all 50 states and analyzed emerging trends in refining and implementing performance-based pay plans for teachers and administrators. This and other periodic reports and meetings with state representatives have enabled states to learn from each other as they pioneer the development of these new programs.

Institutions Participating in SREB/PIPSE Project: Coppin State College, South Carolina State College, Southern University at Baton Rouge

Reports: *A Progress Report and Recommendations on Educational Improvements in the SREB States*

"Major Reports on Teacher Education: What Do They Mean for States?"

"News from the States on Performance-Based Incentive Programs"

"1986—Incentive Programs for Teachers and Administrators: How Are The Doing?"

"Serious Shortages of Science and Mathematics Teachers: What SREB States are Doing"

Staff: William C. Brown, Lynn M. Cornett, Jennifer C. Friday, Mark D. Musick, David S. Spence

Establishing Standards and Assessments to Improve Quality in Higher Education

SREB's *Progress Report and Recommendations on Educational Improvements in the SREB States* notes that, "States can also claim progress in higher education, although improvement there has been less dramatic and not as widespread." Hence, the recommendations are directed to the basic suggestions which SREB has been making: Colleges and universities should define college-level study and establish standards for placing students in courses that will earn degree credits. They must inform students of these standards so that students will be prepared to begin academic work in higher education. SREB also calls for assessments of student performance prior to allowing college students to undertake upper-level study.

The *Progress Report* notes that advances have been made in the area of raising admission standards. Less attention has been given to the definition of credit-earning study and to clear-cut placement standards. When classes are composed of students with adequate preparation and needed background, it can ultimately lead to strengthening the curriculum.

A preoccupation with the uniqueness of individual institutions and their own standards is working against efforts to address the problem of preparation for college and remedial education in college. For a time at least, states will have to coordinate basic or threshold standards for placement in degree-earning study if these problems are to be addressed systematically. A major thrust is for schools and colleges to work together in determining skills that students need along the way to be successful in college. School-college cooperation is a key element in developing programs that adequately prepare high school students for advanced study.

SREB has issued a new report from its Commission for Educational Quality directed to the two-year college and its role in providing access to quality undergraduate education. Meetings were held with state agency representatives and key administrators from two-year colleges throughout the region to establish direction for the report and its recommendations.

The two-year college plays a vital and unique role in the higher education system. Half of the nation's freshmen begin their collegiate experience in two-year colleges. In some SREB states, over two-thirds of teacher education graduates start their baccalaureate studies at a two-year college. And, most high school students identify the two-year college as the "local" college providing ready access, both geographically and financially. This means that to these students the standards demanded by the two-year colleges are those they will try to meet.

Because of open door admission policies, the range of abilities and preparation of students in two-year colleges is broad. In addition, the two-year college offers an extremely wide spectrum of programs—from adult basic education and remedial programs for high school graduates to occupational training for immediate employment and programs for students who transfer to senior colleges and universities.

The quality of undergraduate education in the two-year college depends greatly upon how the diverse kinds of students progress through their program of study. By having standards that must be met before a student can enter into courses for credit toward the associate and baccalaureate degrees, both the student and the college benefit—the student because the chance for success is increased; the college because it can maintain open admission while raising standards for undergraduate education.

SREB recommends that individual two-year colleges identify and implement separate standards for placement into degree-credit study for students wishing to enroll in occupational programs and students seeking entrance into transfer programs. Faculty should lead in the development of these standards and assessments, and the standards should be evaluated periodically to determine their validity. States should coordinate the efforts of the individual institutions to assure that a common statewide meaning for degree study extends across all institutions within a state system.

Those students who do not qualify for immediate placement into degree-credit courses should be directed to remedial programs for which they will receive no credit toward any degree. Exit standards, based on outcomes and reflecting the original placement standards, must also be established to ensure that students have gained the necessary skills before being permitted to begin degree-credit study.

The two-year college is called upon to strengthen its ties with local schools so that students and counseling staff have a clear understanding of what is required for entry into degree-credit study, and two-year colleges are in a unique position to assist the schools in developing programs to strengthen needed skills.

Of particular importance are the recommendations related to strengthening the curriculum in transfer programs and establishing standards which must be met before students in these programs enter upper-level study in senior institutions.

Accomplishing this will require far stronger ties between faculties of the two-year college and the senior institutions to ensure that the credits earned by students at the two-year college will transfer to the senior institutions. It is equally important to establish standards for students graduating from occupational programs so that they have the academic as well as occupational skills employers look for and so that they will be in a position to enter into degree-credit courses should they decide to seek a bachelor's degree.

Actions to improve quality in undergraduate education may be initiated by colleges and universities but states have a vital role to play in assuring that improvements permeate throughout the higher education system.

Reports: *Access to Quality Undergraduate Education in the Two-Year College*

A Progress Report and Recommendations on Educational Improvements in the SREB States

Staff: Margaret A. Jorgensen, David S. Spence

Strengthening Student Preparation and Measuring Achievement in High School

> *"The state board of education should establish and raise standards for the high school curriculum."*
>
> *The Need for Quality*, SREB, 1981

States have taken decisive actions to improve education in high school. It is at this level that some of the greatest progress has occurred.

Information gathered from the state departments of education for SREB's *Progress Report and Recommendations for Educational Improvements in the SREB States* confirms that raising the high school graduation requirements and creating special diplomas for college-bound students have resulted in students taking more basic and advanced high school academic courses. SREB recommends that states "hang tough" in implementing the new high school graduation requirements and go beyond citing and counting credits to focus on the content of courses.

Improved student learning is the ultimate goal of all the educational improvement efforts and to gain public support for future reforms will require clear evidence that students are learning more.

All SREB states have expanded their high school testing programs. However, states generally do not know whether those students who intend to enter college are acquiring the skills necessary to handle college-level study. SREB is convinced that a new type of student assessment is called for—one that will motivate students and let them and their teachers know whether students are on schedule to be ready for college. SREB recommends that states evaluate the purposes and priorities of the entire range of their high school tests and make a college-preparation assessment part of their revised testing program.

A first step in reviewing state testing programs is to consider the types of testing programs available and how tests are being used. The two basic types of tests are norm-referenced, which permits comparing an individual test score with the performance of others who have taken the same test under similar circumstances; and criterion-referenced, which permits comparing a test score with a certain standard or level of mastery. An SREB report provided clear definitions of these two basic types of tests and a discussion of what the tests can and cannot do.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is widely recognized as providing the most accurate current national and regional results on student achievement. Eight SREB states—Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia—participated in the SREB/National Assessment pilot program. Eleventh grade students were tested on reading and writing abilities in 1986; in 1987, tests were in mathematics and U.S. history. These states now have information that tells them how their students are doing compared to the national and regional results *and* compared to students in the other participating states. These states also have the 1986 and 1987 results about students' achievement so they can reliably measure state-level progress against these benchmarks.

The SREB/National Assessment pilot program has proved that it is practical and feasible to obtain state-by-state information on student achievement. The *Progress Report* recommends that SREB states be in the first group of states to participate in the proposed nationwide assessment program endorsed by the National Assessment of Educational Progress, the United States Department of Education, and the Chief State School Officers organization.

For some time, SREB has been pursuing effective methods to convey to high school students just what skills and knowledge are required for college-level study. Two meetings with representatives from the 15 SREB states were held to discuss establishing clear standards and ways to assess the probability of student success in college work early enough in high school so that there is time to help unprepared students.

Since 1971, the William R. Kenan, Jr. Charitable Trust Fund has committed nearly $12 million, administered by SREB, for programs in historically black colleges. A new Kenan-funded project got underway this year with Dillard University, Winston-Salem State University, and Virginia Union University.

These colleges will be developing school-college programs to encourage and prepare "high risk, high potential" disadvantaged minority students to enroll in and graduate from college. Each of the institutions will work with two neighboring high schools, community and business leaders, and parents to establish model programs demonstrating approaches that will help the vast "middle" group of students who have the potential for college study but lack needed skills and competencies. Each high school will have some 60 to 100 students participating in the model programs each year, and additional institutions are expected to participate in the project in coming years.

Finding ways to strengthen the basic competencies—communicating, learning, thinking, problem-solving—of students enrolled in vocational education has been a key element in SREB's efforts to improve the quality of high school education. An SREB publication released this year presents brief descriptions of successful approaches that states, local school districts, and individual schools have taken to incorporate and/or expand the teaching of these basic competencies.

In addition, 13 SREB states—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia—have joined with the Southern Regional Education Board and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education to form the SREB-State Vocational Education Consortium. Each member state will establish a site where new approaches for strengthening the basic competencies will be demonstrated. Both academic and vocational teachers will be involved in developing programs that feature applied, or "hands-on," methods of instruction to motivate and challenge vocational students. Members will benefit from sharing the expenses of planning and development and will have the advantage of learning from the various field-tested strategies "what works" and how to develop similar approaches without having to test them individually.

Despite the improvements in the high schools, one of our nation's most disturbing educational problems is high school dropouts. The national dropout rate, according to the U. S. Department of Education, is 29.4 percent; in two-thirds of the SREB states the rate is even higher. SREB's *Progress Report* recommends that states develop procedures that enable them to know the size and nature of the dropout problem, continue current early childhood education and intervention programs to help students in the early grades, and create new programs for middle and high school students.

Reports: *A Progress Report and Recommendations on Educational Improvements in the SREB States*

Basic Differences Between Norm-Referenced and Criterion-Referenced Tests

Measuring Student Achievement: Comparable Test Results for Participating SREB States, the Region, and the Nation

Strengthening the Basic Competencies of Students Enrolled in Vocational Education

Staff: Lynn M. Cornett, Margaret A. Jorgenson, Stephanie A. Korcheck, Mark D. Musick, David S. Spence

Remedial Education in College

> *"... a general affirmation to higher quality demands that correspondingly greater attention be given to effective means of providing remedial education."*
>
> *The Need for Quality*, SREB, 1981

In the long term, educational reforms underway in the schools should reduce substantially the number of unprepared students entering college. Until that takes place, most colleges and universities will have to provide programs to help students attain the skills needed to undertake degree-credit study.

National and state reports show that as many as 50 percent of first-time college students do not have the necessary skills to begin degree-credit coursework. In an effort to get information on the extent of remedial/developmental education at the college level, SREB surveyed two-year and four-year public institutions of higher education across the region. The response rate of over 80 percent indicates the high level of interest in what colleges are doing to help their unprepared students and gives strong credibility to the findings as a fairly accurate picture of the current situation. The survey revealed that:

- Almost 100 combinations of 70 different tests in reading, writing, and mathematics are used to place students in "college-level" work.
- Cut-off scores on placement tests are so broad—both among institutions and states—that there appears to be little consensus on what knowledge and skills are required to undertake "college-level" study.
- Over 50 percent of the colleges use "completion of course or program sequence" as the primary means for permitting students to exit from remedial/developmental programs into degree-earning study.
- Only about half of the institutions conduct follow-up studies of students completing remedial/developmental programs.
- Student opinion is the most commonly used method to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of remedial/developmental programs.

Gathering information of this nature provides educational and governmental leaders with information pointing to some of the unresolved issues—lack of agreement on what remedial/developmental education is, how it can best be delivered, and how it can best be evaluated.

In an effort to assist states and institutions in dealing with some of these unresolved issues, SREB staff have been meeting with directors of remedial/developmental programs and compiling information on effective programs with clearly defined goals for assuring students' ultimate success in college study.

Perhaps most important, SREB's survey gives an indication of the extent of remedial/developmental education and the number of unprepared students entering colleges and universities in the SREB states. With this knowledge, it is hoped that officials will take action to:

- Establish consistent placement standards for college degree-credit work at state and institutional levels.
- Assure that degree-credit is awarded only for work at the collegiate level.
- Establish formal written policies that reflect performance goals for governing remedial/developmental programs.
- Develop guidelines for evaluating program strengths, weaknesses, and effectiveness on a regular and routine basis.

As states and institutions strive to improve the quality of undergraduate education, they must take into account the large numbers of unprepared students and recognize that programs are needed to help these students acquire basic skills and knowledge for success.

Reports: *A Report on College-Level Remedial/Developmental Programs in SREB States*

"College-Level Study: What Is It?"

Staff: Ansley A. Abraham, Margaret A. Jorgensen, David S. Spence

Providing States with Comparable Higher Education Data

One of the long-term, continuing objectives of SREB is to provide a flow of viable statistics and related information to assist states in identifying priorities and goals and determining feasible ways of moving toward them.

SREB publications often include tables offering state-by-state information that provide opportunities for "at-a-glance" comparisons. For example, SREB's new *Progress Report and Recommendations on Educational Improvements in the SREB States* has 15 tables summarizing indicators of educational progress for individual SREB states. The ability to have up-to-date data available is largely due to the contact SREB maintains with key personnel in state agencies for higher education and departments of education.

Because of the SREB-State Data Exchange, SREB states have become widely recognized for sharing comparable information on a variety of higher education measures. This sharing of information is a key factor in tracking progress and in bringing state actions to bear on problems.

Over the past several years refinements and increased automation in the Data Exchange have taken place and, as a result, this year's Data Exchange information was distributed earlier than ever before. Consequently, as decisions on higher education were being made, key state officials had state-by-state information on appropriations, faculty salaries, enrollments, and other significant factors affecting higher education.

To assure that comparability, uniformity, and timeliness remain at the high levels that have developed over the years, SREB meets periodically with state education staff to "fine tune" the process for sharing information. This year staff also met with key state legislative and executive staff to discuss the kinds of data that are currently being collected and determine areas in which additional information would be helpful.

Thirty years ago the Southern Regional Education Board published its first *Fact Book on Higher Education* chronicling the development and progress of higher education in the region. The 1986 edition of this biennial series continues the tradition of emphasizing significant national, regional, and SREB-state trends affecting decisions about higher education. Data contained in the 67 tables in the 1986 *Fact Book* edition show that:

- In the SREB states the college-going rate remains below the national average, even though during the 1980s enrollment has increased 6 percent—almost five times the nationwide increase.
- More than one-third of the college students in the SREB states are enrolled in two-year colleges.
- Women now represent over 53 percent of all higher education enrollments and part-time students over 40 percent.
- For the first time in decades, the number of black college students has fallen nationwide. In the SREB states there has been a small increase.

- Both nationally and in the SREB states, the proportion of state taxes going to higher education fell.
- State resident undergraduate students now pay tuition and required fees of more than $1,000 per year in most SREB state-supported four-year colleges; the comparable figure at two-year colleges is about $425.
- About half of the student aid awarded by SREB-state programs is based on the financial need of the students; nationwide the figure is 85 percent.

In addition to the *Fact Book*, during the year SREB released several summaries and publications providing data on items of specific interest to state leaders involved in setting educational policies.

SREB is also exploring its role in assisting states to gather data that will assist them in setting policies and making decisions concerning health professions education. After nearly two decades, the federal government has virtually withdrawn from leadership in the planning and support of health professions education. This means that responsibility has been turned over to the states; understandably, most are not yet prepared to assume it.

Most states lack good up-to-date data about the health professionals in their states, particularly about changes in supply. They also lack procedures for making projections of future demands and few have policy analysts to examine data and make recommendations.

It has been proposed that SREB assist states in developing a regional health manpower statistics program, similar to the SREB-State Data Exchange system. During the year, SREB met with its Commission on Health and Human Services and sponsored a meeting with state personnel, legislators, and representatives of academic health centers and the health professions to discuss how this might be accomplished. The best approach is to compile and analyze the data that are available from the states and to work with state leaders to refine and build a comprehensive regional data program. It will take time to build a comprehensive system, but it is important to get started so that states can make informed decisions on health professions education.

Reports: *Degrees Awarded in the Nation and the SREB States*

"Higher Education Studies, Reports, and Surveys in the SREB States"

Legislative Reports

SREB Fact Book on Higher Education

State-Level Needs and Uses for Statistical Data About Health Manpower in the SREB States

"Tuition in SREB States, 1987—Changes for 1988"

Staff: Stephanie A. Korcheck, Joseph L. Marks, Harold L. McPheeters, Mark D. Musick, E. F. Schietinger, E. L. Whitley

Sharing Regional Resources in Higher Education

A continuing responsibility of the Southern Regional Education Board is to handle arrangements for interstate and inter-institutional sharing of high-cost and uncommon academic programs. Through these arrangements states are able to avoid the costs of unnecessary program duplication, strengthen existing programs, and offer their residents greater educational opportunities.

Interstate Contracts in Health Professions

Through the SREB student exchange program, approximately 1,000 students are receiving their training in dentistry, medicine, optometry, osteopathic medicine, podiatry, and veterinary medicine.

States contracting with SREB for access to programs in out-of-state institutions are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Institutions participating in the SREB student contract program are: Auburn University (veterinary medicine), Baylor College of Dentistry, Emory University (medicine), Louisiana State University (dentistry and veterinary medicine), Meharry Medical College (dentistry and medicine), Mercer University (family medicine), Morehouse School of Medicine, North Carolina State University (veterinary medicine), Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Dr. William M. Scholl College of Podiatric Medicine, Southern College of Optometry, Southeastern College of Osteopathic Medicine, Tuskegee University (veterinary medicine), University of Alabama at Birmingham (optometry), University of Georgia (veterinary medicine) University of Houston (optometry), University of Louisville (dentistry), University of Oklahoma College of Dentistry, University of Tennessee (dentistry), and West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine

The Academic Common Market

The SREB Academic Common Market permits students from participating states to enroll in specialized graduate and undergraduate programs in out-of-state institutions at in-state tuition rates. Nearly 1,000 baccalaureate and graduate programs at 113 colleges and universities in the SREB region will be available to residents of participating states for the 1987-88 academic year. The participating states are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Faculty Research Grants

Many colleges today do not have all the specialized equipment and resources needed for advanced research or the extra funds to help faculty travel to the campuses that do have these facilities.

The Southern Regional Education Board manages a program which enables faculty of colleges and universities in Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee to obtain supplemental support for traveling to off-campus facilities to improve their research and teaching abilities. The small grants—usually from $250 to $750—cover modest expenses for living and travel and for fees incurred in the use of equipment. Participating states provide appropriations for the grants. The program encourages colleges and universities with uncommon equipment and facilities to make these installations readily available to researchers and professors in the natural and social sciences and the humanities.

Staff: Ann H. Carter, E. F. Schietinger

Members of the Board

Governor Joe Frank Harris, *Chairman*
Edward J. Boling, *Vice-Chairman*
Cecil J. Picard, *Treasurer*

	Term Expires
Alabama	
Guy Hunt, *Governor*	1991
Joe M. Ford, *State Representative*	1987
Paul R. Hubbert, *Executive Secretary,* Alabama Education Association	1988
†James E. Martin, *President,* Auburn University	1990
Joab L. Thomas, *President,* University of Alabama	1989
Arkansas	
Bill Clinton, *Governor*	1991
†Joseph K. Mahony, *State Representative*	1988
Robert McGinnis, *State Representative*	1989
Nick Wilson, *State Senator*	1987
Nancy Wood, *Little Rock*	1990
Florida	
Bob Martinez, *Governor*	1991
Pat Frank, *State Senator*	1990
†Robert H. McCabe, *President,* Miami-Dade Community College	1987
John Robert Middlemas, Panama City	1988
†*Charles B. Reed, *Chancellor,* State University System of Florida	1989
Georgia	
†Joe Frank Harris, *Governor*	1991
Paul C. Broun, *State Senator*	1988
Charles W. Merideth, *Chancellor,* Atlanta University Center	1987
Lamar R. Plunkett, Bowdon	1990
†H. Dean Propst, *Chancellor,* State University System of Georgia	1989
Kentucky	
†Martha Layne Collins, *Governor*	1987
Edward T. Breathitt, Cadiz	1990
Ed Ford, *State Senator*	1987
Otis A. Singletary, *President,* University of Kentucky	1989
Harry M. Snyder, Lexington	1988
Louisiana	
Edwin W. Edwards, *Governor*	1988
Sharon P. Beard, *Deputy Commissioner,* Louisiana Board of Regents	1990
Jack V. Doland, Lake Charles	1988
Jimmy D. Long, *State Representative*	1989
†*Cecil J. Picard, *State Senator*	1987
Maryland	
William D. Schaefer, *Governor*	1991
†*Arthur Dorman, *State Senator*	1990
Rhoda M. Dorsey, *President,* Goucher College	1987
Sheldon H. Knorr, *Commissioner,* Maryland State Board for Higher Education	1989
†John S. Toll, *President,* University of Maryland	1988

Mississippi

William Allain, *Governor*	1988
†Thomas D. Bourdeaux, Meridian	1987
Carl J. Gordon, Jr., *State Senator*	1988
James A. Hefner, *President*, Jackson State University	1990
John A. Peoples, Jr., Jackson	1989

North Carolina

James G. Martin, *Governor*	1989
†William Friday, *President Emeritus*, University of North Carolina	1987
Robert B. Jordan III, *Lieutenant Governor*	1988
Phillip J. Kirk, Jr., *Chief of Staff*, Office of the Governor	1990
†Paul S. Smith, *State Senator*	1989

Oklahoma

Henry Bellmon, *Governor*	1991
Joseph L. Cox, Claremore	1989
Bernice Shedrick, *State Senator*	1990
†Penny Williams, *State Representative*	1988

South Carolina

Carroll A. Campbell, Jr., *Governor*	1991
Harry A. Chapman, Jr., Greenville	1987
J. Floyd Hall, Columbia	1990
Robert C. Lake, Jr., Whitmire	1988
†Kay Patterson, *State Senator*	1989

---

† Executive Committee Member—The Executive Committee has full power to act between Board meetings. It is composed of one Board member from each state and several from the region at large.

* Finance Committee Member—The Finance Committee, a subcommittee of the Executive Committee, prepares an annual budget and presents it and other financial policy matters to the Executive Committee.

Tennessee

Ned McWherter, *Governor*	1991
†* Edward J. Boling, *President*, University of Tennessee	1987
†* Leonard C. Dunavant, *State Senator*	1990
Thomas J. Garland, *Chancellor*, State University and Community College System, State Board of Regents	1989
Arliss L. Roaden, *Executive Director*, Tennessee Higher Education Commission	1988

Texas

William P. Clements, Jr., *Governor*	1991
Wilhelmina R. Delco, *State Representative*	1989
Carl A. Parker, *State Senator*	1988
†Max Sherman, *Dean*, LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas	1990

Virginia

†Gerald L. Baliles, *Governor*	1990
Hunter B. Andrews, *State Senator*	1990
Donald J. Finley, *Secretary of Education*	1988
Dorothy S. McDiarmid, *State Delegate*	1989
Robert M. O'Neil, *President*, University of Virginia	1987

West Virginia

Arch A. Moore, Jr., *Governor*	1989
†Thomas W. Cole, Jr., *Chancellor* West Virginia Board of Regents	1989
Lowell E. Johnson, Lewisburg	1988
Sandy Rogers, *State Delegate*	1987
F. Lyle Sattes, *State Delegate*	1986

Advisory Groups

Legislative Advisory Council 1986-87

Jimmy D. Long, *Chairman*
Pat Frank, *Vice-Chairman*

Hunter B. Andrews, *State Senator*, Hampton, Virginia
Joe Barrows, *State Representative*, Versailles, Kentucky
Paul C. Broun, *State Senator*, Athens, Georgia
Charles W. Capps, Jr., *State Representative*, Cleveland, Mississippi
Laurence A. Cobb, *State Senator*, Raleigh, North Carolina
Wilhelmina R. Delco, *State Representative*, Austin, Texas
Alan A. Diamonstein, *State Delegate*, Newport News, Virginia
Arthur Dorman, *State Senator*, Beltsville, Maryland
Leonard C. Dunavant, *State Senator*, Millington, Tennessee
Ed Ford, *State Senator*, Cynthiana, Kentucky
Joe M. Ford, *State Representative*, Gadsen, Alabama
V. Thomas Forehand, Jr., *State Delegate*, Chesapeake, Virginia
John C. Foster, *State Senator*, Cornelia, Georgia
Pat Frank, *State Senator*, Tampa, Florida
T. Ed Garrison, *State Senator*, Anderson, South Carolina
Earl Goodwin, *State Senator*, Selma, Alabama
Carl J. Gordon, Jr., *State Senator*, Okolona, Mississippi
James M. Henry, *State Representative*, Kingston, Tennessee
David K. Karem, *State Senator*, Louisville, Kentucky
Jimmy D. Long, *State Representative*, Natchitoches, Louisiana
Joseph K. Mahony, *State Representative*, El Dorado, Arkansas
John W. Matthews, Jr., *State Senator*, Bowman, South Carolina
Dorothy S. McDiarmid, *State Delegate*, Vienna, Virginia
Robert L. McGinnis, *State Representative*, Marianna, Arkansas
Robert N. McLellan, *State Representative*, Seneca, South Carolina
James C. Moore, *State Representative*, West Green, Georgia
Carl A. Parker, *State Senator*, Port Arthur, Texas
Kay Patterson, *State Senator*, Columbia, South Carolina
Curtis Peterson, *State Senator*, Eaton Park, Florida
Lewis Phillips, *State Representative*, Greer, South Carolina
Cecil J. Picard, *State Senator*, Maurice, Louisiana
Carolyn Pollan, *State Representative*, Fort Smith, Arkansas
Perrin Purvis, *State Senator*, Tupelo, Mississippi
Jody Richards, *State Representative*, Bowling Green, Kentucky
Sandy Rogers, *State Delegate*, Vienna, West Virginia
Stanley Russ, *State Senator*, Conway, Arkansas
F. Lyle Sattes, *State Delegate*, Charleston, West Virginia
Bernice Shedrick, *State Senator*, Stillwater, Oklahoma
Paul S. Smith, *State Senator*, Salisbury, North Carolina
Francis C. Thompson, *State Representative*, Delhi, Louisiana
Lois S. Walker, *State Representative*, Statesville, North Carolina
Stanley C. Walker, *State Senator*, Norfolk, Virginia
Thomas H. Walman, *State Representative*, McComb, Mississippi
Eleanor Weinstock, *State Senator*, West Palm Beach, Florida
T. K. Wetherell, *State Representative*, Daytona Beach, Florida
Penny Williams, *State Representative*, Tulsa, Oklahoma
Nick Wilson, *State Senator*, Pocahontas, Arkansas

SREB Commission for Educational Quality

Richard W. Riley, *Chairman*
Stephen A. Cobb, *Vice-Chairman*

Kenneth H. Ashworth, *Commissioner*, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
Hillary Rodham Clinton, Little Rock, Arkansas
Stephen A. Cobb, Nashville, Tennessee
Alton C. Crews, *Superintendent*, Gwinnett County Public Schools, Georgia
S. John Davis, *Superintendent of Public Instruction*, Virginia Department of Education
John M. Folks, *Superintendent*, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Christopher C. Fordham III, *Chancellor*, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
William U. Harris, *Director*, Northeastern Regional Office, Educational Testing Service
Barbara R. Hatton, *Dean*, School of Education, Tuskegee University
Nancy K. Kopp, *State Delegate*, Maryland
Benjamin J. Lambert III, *State Senator*, Virginia
Curtis Peterson, *State Senator*, Florida
Charles B. Reed, *Chancellor*, State University System of Florida
Richard W. Riley, Columbia, South Carolina
Robert W. Scott, *State President*, North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges

Commission on Health and Human Services

Calvin A. Michaels, *Chairman*
Louis W. Sullivan, *Vice-Chairman*

Al Austin, *Secretary of the Cabinet for Human Resources*, Commonwealth of Kentucky
Peter P. Bosomworth, *Chancellor*, Albert B. Chandler Medical School, University of Kentucky
Bracey Campbell, *President*, The Bracey Campbell Company, Franklin, Tennessee
Gordon H. DeFriese, *Director*, Health Services Research Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Leon H. Ginsberg, *Professor of Social Work*, University of South Carolina
Marilyn Goldwater, *Federal Relations Officer*, Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
Albert Randel Hendrix, *Executive Director*, Mississippi Department of Mental Health
Moses C. Jones, *Neurosurgeon*, Tuscaloosa, Alabama
Phillip J. Kirk, Jr., *Chief of Staff*, Office of the Governor, North Carolina
Calvin A. Michaels, *Director of Personnel Administration*, Burlington Industries, Inc., Greensboro, North Carolina
William J. Page, *Secretary*, Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services
Clayton Rich, *Provost and Vice President for Health Services*, University of Oklahoma
Eleanor L. Richardson, *State Representative*, Decatur, Georgia
Sandra L. Robinson, *Secretary*, Louisiana Department of Health and Human Resources
Ray Scott, *Director*, Arkansas Department of Human Services
Sarah Shuptrine, *Health and Human Services Consultant*, Columbia, South Carolina
Louis W. Sullivan, *President*, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia
Eva S. Teig, *Secretary of Human Resources*, Commonwealth of Virginia
R. Lawrence Williams, *Director*, Health and Human Development, Georgia Office of Planning and Budget

Professional Staff

Winfred L. Godwin, *President*

Ansley A. Abraham, *Research Associate*
Eula Aiken, *Project Director,* Continuing Nursing Education in Computer Technology
Leon Benham, *Research Assistant/Librarian*
James E. Brawner, *Accountant/Assistant Treasurer*
William C. Brown, *Senior Consultant,* Educational Opportunity Programs
Ann H. Carter, *Program Assistant*
LaJuana Cochrane, *Project Director,* Competency and Productivity of Mental Health Workers
Lynn M. Cornett, *Associate Director for School-College Programs*
Jennifer C. Friday, *Associate Director for Educational Opportunity Programs*
Jean Johnson, *Administrative Associate*
Margaret A. Jorgensen, *Research Associate*
Stephanie A. Korcheck, *Research Assistant*
Joseph L. Marks, *Associate for Regional Data Services*
Harold L. McPheeters, *Director,* Health and Human Services Programs
Mark D. Musick, *Director,* State Services and Information
E. F. Schietinger, *Senior Consultant*
Audrey F. Spector, *Nursing Programs Director, Executive Director/*Southern Council on Collegiate Education for Nursing
David S. Spence, *Vice-President and Director,* Office of Educational Policies
Margaret A. Sullivan, *Editor and Publications Officer*
E. L. Whitley, *Associate Director for Health Programs*

Audit

Deloitte
Haskins+Sells

Suite 1800
100 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-1943
(404) 656-1500
TWX 810-751-3131

Auditors' Opinion

Board of Control for
Southern Regional Education:

We have examined the balance sheets of the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education as of June 30, 1986 and 1985 and the related statements of support, revenue, and expenses and changes in fund balances for the years then ended. Our examinations were made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and, accordingly, included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion, the afore-mentioned financial statements present fairly the financial position of the Board at June 30, 1986 and 1985 and the results of its operations for the years then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a consistent basis.

Deloitte Haskins & Sells

August 8, 1986

Balance Sheets, June 30, 1986 and 1985

ASSETS	1986	1985
Current Assets:		
Cash	$ 315,182	$ 92,020
United States Treasury bills	2,927,545	3,061,559
Reimbursements receivable from grantors	45,035	4,927
Other current assets	14,653	9,293
Total current assets	3,302,415	3,167,799
Furniture and Equipment — Net	216,075	110,766
Agency Funds		
Cash	50,000	25,000
Accounts receivable	472,100	297,000
Total agency funds	522,100	322,000
Total Assets	$4,040,590	$3,600,565

LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES		
Current Liabilities:		
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	$ 219,421	$ 171,031
Deferred revenue — Membership dues	75,600	59,150
Total current liabilities	295,021	230,181
Agency Funds:		
Appropriations payable to regional service institutions for student places and for student and institutional aid	472,100	322,000
Appropriations payable to Educational Testing Service for development of teacher certification tests	50,000	
Total agency funds	522,100	322,000
Fund Balances:		
General fund:		
Allocated for contingencies	400,000	400,000
Allocated for relocation of offices	54,662	150,000
Allocated to quality fund	25,000	
Allocated for general fund operations	2,301,315	2,305,983
Total	2,780,977	2,855,983
Restricted funds	442,492	192,401
Total fund balances	3,223,469	3,048,384
Total Liabilities and Fund Balances	$4,040,590	$3,600,565

See notes to the financial statements.

Statements of Support, Revenue, and Expenses and Changes in Fund Balances for the Years Ended June 30, 1986 and 1985

	1986	1985
Support and Revenue:		
Appropriations by states	$1,172,000	$1,123,000
Grants and contract revenue—foundations, federal agencies, and state agencies	1,274,808	645,041
Membership dues—Southern Council on Collegiate Education for Nursing	80,150	80,700
Contributions	25,000	
Interest	280,038	366,326
Miscellaneous revenue	43,624	20,094
Total	2,875,620	2,235,161
Expenses:		
Administration and development	786,270	694,142
Research and programs	1,892,457	1,543,064
Relocation	21,808	
Total	2,700,535	2,237,206
Support and Revenue in Excess of (Less Than) Expenses	175,085	(2,045)
Fund Balances, Beginning of Year	3,048,384	3,050,429
Fund Balances, End of Year	$3,223,469	$3,048,384

Notes to the Financial Statements for the Years Ended June 30, 1986 and 1985

1. **Significant Accounting Policies**

The fifteen member states appropriate funds for support of the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education ("SREB"). These funds are used for administration, development, research, and programs and are accounted for in the general fund.

Support for some of SREB's programs is received from foundations and federal and state agencies. These funds may be used only for programs under agreements with the grantors and are therefore accounted for in restricted funds.

SREB serves as financial agent and administrator in interstate arrangements for regional educational services and institutions. Cash held by SREB as fiscal agent and the corresponding liability for the disbursement of that cash are accounted for as agency funds.

United States Treasury bills are stated at cost which approximates market, plus accrued interest.

Furniture and equipment are stated at cost less accumulated depreciation. Depreciation is computed by the straightline method based on the estimated useful lives of the classes of depreciable property.

2. **Tax Status**

SREB is exempt from Federal income taxes under the provisions of Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and has been classified as an organization that is not a private foundation as defined by Section 509(a) of the Code. Contributions to SREB are deductible from taxable income by donors as provided in Section 170 of the Code.

3. **Pension Plan**

SREB has a contributory pension plan which covers substantially all employees and provides for the purchase of individual deferred annuity contracts from Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America. SREB's pension expense was $70,361 and $54,697 for the years ended June 30, 1986 and 1985, respectively.

4. **Agency Funds**

As fiscal agent and administrator in interstate arrangements for regional educational services and institutions, SREB received and disbursed state appropriations of $12,354,308 and $12,846,676 for the years ended June 30, 1986 and 1985, respectively.

SREB Publications

Improving the Quality of Education

A Progress Report and Recommendations on Educational Improvements in the SREB States—Provides state-by-state information on key indicators of educational progress, including high school graduation requirements and special advanced placement courses, drop-out rates, student testing programs, college admissions requirements, standards for teachers, incentive programs for teachers, school leadership initiatives, and teacher and faculty salaries. Discusses the commitments state governmental and educational leaders must make and recommends specific actions to sustain the momentum for educational improvement in schools and colleges.

Access to Quality Undergraduate Education in the Two-Year College—Emphasizes the importance of two-year colleges in the drive to improve undergraduate education, stressing the need to maintain access and upgrade quality in this vital sector of higher education. Recommends specific actions to establish standards for students intending to transfer to senior institutions and for students enrolled in vocational programs.

A Report on College-Level Remedial/Developmental Programs in SREB States—Summarizes findings of an SREB survey of public two-year and four-year colleges in the 15 SREB states and discusses actions states and institutions can take to improve programs that help unprepared students gain the skills needed for college-level study.

"College-Level Study: What Is It?"—Raises important questions about college placement standards based on findings of a recently-completed SREB survey. Findings show a wide variation in the tests and cut-off scores used to place students in either college degree-credit or remedial/developmental courses.

Measuring Student Achievement: Comparable Tests Results for Participating SREB States, the Region, and the Nation—Outlines the findings, significance, and implications of the Southern Regional Education Board/National Assessment of Educational Progress 1986 pilot program, which measured reading and writing proficiency of 11th grade students. SREB states participating in the 1986 SREB/NAEP program are: Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Basic Differences Between Norm-Referenced and Criterion-Referenced Tests—Clearly defines the two basic types of tests used to measure student achievement and discusses what the tests can and cannot do to assist state leaders in their ongoing efforts to determine the effectiveness of state testing programs.

"Major Reports on Teacher Education: What Do They Mean for States?"—Compares and discusses recommendations for improving teacher education advanced by SREB with those in recent reports from the Holmes Group, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, and the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education.

"Serious Shortages of Science and Mathematics Teachers: What SREB States Are Doing"— Examines supply and demand of science and mathematics teachers and initiatives (loan-scholarships, alternative certification, retraining programs) underway in the SREB states to combat shortages.

Strengthening the Basic Competencies of Students Enrolled in Vocational Education—Presents brief descriptions of successful approaches that states, local school districts, and individual schools have taken to incorporate and/or expand the teaching of basic academic skills through applying the knowledge in vocational education programs.

Basic Planning Information

SREB Fact Book on Higher Education, 1986—SREB's biennial *Fact Book* series serves as a major source of statistical data on finances, enrollments, degrees, and other significant indicators related to higher education. This latest edition has more than 65 tables providing "at-a-glance" comparable information for the SREB region, the nation, and each of the 15 SREB states.

Degrees Awarded in the Nation and the SREB States—Looks at data on number of associate, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees awarded by higher education institutions in the SREB region and discusses trends in kinds of degrees being awarded.

State-Level Needs and Uses for Statistical Data About Health Manpower in SREB States—Examines what states are now doing in gathering and analyzing statistical data about health manpower, and suggests how the states might establish stronger state programs as well as a regional data program to help plan educational programs and better health care for their citizens.

The following releases highlight information on higher education issues:

"Agenda for Higher Education: Retrospect and Prospect"

"Higher Education Studies, Reports, and Surveys in the SREB States"

Legislative Reports

"Tuition in SREB States, 1987—Changes for 1988"

Health/Mental Health/Human Services/Nursing

Assessing and Improving the Performance of Psychosocial Rehabilitation Staff

Case Managers for the Chronically Mentally Ill: Assessing and Improving Their Performance

Forensic Mental Health Workers: Assessing and Improving Their Performance

"Health Professionals for the Elderly"

Nursing Research as a Diagnostic Approach in Nursing Education, Administration, and Practice

Shifting Patterns of Nursing Practice: Impact on Nursing Education